## K9GTTALS - REDACTED 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 20 CR 233 (JFK) V. 5 MILESH TALREJA, 6 Defendant. 7 -----x New York, N.Y. 8 September 16, 2020 10:55 a.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. JOHN F. KEENAN, 11 District Judge 12 APPEARANCES 13 AUDREY STRAUSS 14 Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 15 ALEXANDER LI 16 PHILLIPS NIZER Attorneys for Defendant 17 BY: ILENE JAROSLAW 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Defendant not present)

THE COURT: This is in the matter of the United States versus Milesh Talreja. The reason we're here is for sentence in absentia, and we're going to proceed under Rule 43(c)(1)(B), and that permits the Court to sentence in absentia when counsel are present in court and if counsel wants that done, and the government certainly does. But before we ever get to that, I want to say something else.

And I don't think I said good morning to you. Good morning, Mr. Li.

MR. LI: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Jaroslaw.

MS. JAROSLAW: Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning to both of you.

And the first thing I want to take up is in your August 24 letter, Ms. Jaroslaw, on the second page you say to me, "Second, Mr. Talreja has failed to pay any amount of the outstanding fees owed by him in exchange for our services to this point, and we have no meaningful assurance that payment will be forthcoming."

I think that you're understating your position there. It doesn't seem to me there's any likelihood, if he absconded, that he's going to pay you. Maybe he will, but that would astound me. You then go on to say, "This has placed me and my firm in a challenging position. Therefore, I am compelled to

respectfully move the Court for payment under Criminal Justice Act 18, United States Code, 3006(a)."

Frankly, I am very much inclined to grant that application, but what I do need from you is an affidavit as to your work on the case, and I guess a very brief memorandum of law as to why you're entitled to it under the CJA. If you can get me that by next Wednesday, I would appreciate it.

Does the government object to their receiving compensation?

MR. LI: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there's no objection, if you give it to me -- well, could you get it to me by next Tuesday? If that's too soon --

MS. JAROSLAW: Your Honor, Wednesday would be best.

THE COURT: Why don't you drop your mask while you're talking. It's very difficult to hear with the mask on.

What did you say, I'm sorry?

MS. JAROSLAW: If it's possible to submit Wednesday rather than Tuesday.

THE COURT: All right, sure, sure.

MS. JAROSLAW: Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine. As I say, I'm very much inclined to grant the application, but I do think I should get an affidavit and a formal motion.

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes, of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

So as I said, this is for sentence, and first I will hear the defense, and that's Ms. Jaroslaw, and I have your written submissions. And frankly, that's one of the reasons that I'm very much inclined to grant your motion to receive CJA payment because you certainly put work into the submissions, there's no doubt about it. That doesn't say how I'm going to rule, but I say you put work into it and they're very well done, so that's why I have said that I am inclined to grant it.

I said I have your submissions, I was looking for them. We have the September 9 submission, then there was a reply submission to the government's memorandum, and that's September 15. I have obviously read both of your submissions, and you go right ahead and tell me anything else that you want to tell me.

MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may, before proceeding -THE COURT: I will give you an opportunity to be
heard.

MR. LI: Just as a threshold matter, before proceeding to the substance of the sentencing, we would ask the Court to make the finding that the defendant is voluntarily not present. That is a required finding before proceeding in absentia.

THE COURT: Well, he certainly isn't. I look around the courtroom, the only people in the courtroom are

Ms. Jaroslaw, you, my deputy, the very able court reporter, and

my law clerk and me. So he's not here, he's not present. I make the finding that he's absent. I have issued a warrant for his arrest and I have found, I think, that he's absconded, and if I didn't formally find that, I find that he absconded.

I had intended and still will read into the record concerning his failure to be here what he has to say in his August 13 email to the government. He wrote on August 13 in an email addressed to the government, I'm quoting from the email, "I am now in China" -- I don't know whether that's true -- "and will not make myself available to U.S. authorities. There is no point attempting to trace this email. It sits behind multiple layers of encryption and, as I have stated, I am in" -- he writes "in" twice -- "I am in in China where there is no extradition to the United States. As a Hong Kong permanent resident with a claim to Chinese nationality, I have no intention of departing the PRC" -- which I take to mean the People's Republic of China -- "and am immune from deportation."

So I make the finding that he's not here and therefore we can proceed under Rule 43(c)(1)(B).

Anything else before I hear from Ms. Jaroslaw?

MR. LI: Just to clarify, your Honor, not only is the defendant not here, but that he is voluntarily not here.

THE COURT: I think the email speaks for itself, but if I'm required to make that finding, I find that it's voluntary, his non-appearance.

MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you for bringing that to my attention.

Ms. Jaroslaw.

MS. JAROSLAW: Thank you, your Honor. I think the salient facts that happened here really aren't in dispute. There is some dispute as to Mr. Talreja's motivation, but he was seeking a credit card, he wrote a bad check in purple highlighter for half a million dollars. Much to his surprise, he didn't only get the credit card but the deposit cleared very rapidly, the next day. And I can cite Chase's own policies that show that that's actually not in conformity with Chase's policy for new accounts or deposits over \$5,000.

Mr. Talreja converted \$116,000 of that money, and it was wrong, and from the moment he was picked up he admitted it was wrong. He pled guilty with no plea agreement. He attempted to continue cooperation that he had been doing for the DEA for approximately eight months. He was incarcerated under extraordinarily difficult conditions. I don't need to recount those now, I think I went into that in great detail in the letter. He suffered greatly.

There's no real dispute that my client suffers from bipolar disease, and I have copies of some of the prescriptions if the Court wishes to see that. He takes a great deal of medication for this bipolar disease. He had to go cold turkey

on the medication, which can actually be very dangerous, when he was at the MCC. He was terrified. He was frightened. He was in a situation with a lockdown where he didn't have enough blankets or other clothing to keep warm or enough food to eat. He was thankfully released on March 26. He was out on bail for a period of time, and subsequent to being fitted with a GPS monitor, he escaped. There's no question that these things happened, there's no question as to the salient facts, although we disagree on some of the details.

If Mr. Talreja simply pled guilty, I submit to the Court there may not even be a dispute with the government as to whether a sentence of time served would be warranted. It was not just 50 days at the MCC, it was under very difficult conditions under the circumstances.

But we do have a situation where he did escape, and as I write in my letters, I think particularly as lawyers, as a judge, we make inferences in this courtroom all the time. And it's worth noting that Mr. Talreja, in addition to having bipolar disease, is brilliant and actually has legal training in Australia. He speaks nine languages. It's undisputed that he has a history of working with intelligence agencies in the past.

THE COURT: That's all very interesting, intelligence agencies, because I did that when I was in the service. I was in an intelligence agency. That's before either of you were

born. That was in the Far East. But I could prove that, I have documents that show that. He says he was in intelligence. His whole background -- he's got ten convictions, doesn't he, in Great Britain, in the United Kingdom?

MS. JAROSLAW: I don't believe it's ten convictions, but there's no dispute that he has a history of fraud; no history of violence or drug crimes, but yes, he does have a history of fraud.

THE COURT: Right. And under the guidelines, I'm permitted to take that into consideration, although it doesn't add points as it would if they were American convictions, right?

MS. JAROSLAW: Correct, your Honor. It's a basis potentially for an upward departure in the criminal history categories.

THE COURT: I'm not really thinking about a departure, I'm thinking about the appropriate level here, because all bets are off because he absconded. I mean he stopped cooperating. I read from his email he's not going to cooperate, he's not going to appear, and if he was in intelligence, for which countries? What did he do? I don't want to give away any national secrets, but all this stuff about intelligence doesn't really mean a lot to me in this case.

MS. JAROSLAW: Your Honor, I can be specific, but I would ask then that the transcript be sealed.

THE COURT: Oh, no, the application to seal anything here is denied. I didn't rule on it.

You asked for that, didn't you --

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes.

THE COURT: -- before? And no, I say all bets are off. The reason I was going to permit things to be sealed was because of his cooperation. He's not cooperating. Nothing is sealed.

MS. JAROSLAW: Your Honor, I'm in a difficult position because I have information regarding even an operation as recently as the last couple of days, but without sealing, Mr. Talreja would be in danger if it were in the public transcript, so I will have to decline.

THE COURT: I'll accept the fact that he did some work for some government or governments in foreign intelligence, but so far as I know, he never did anything for the American government.

MS. JAROSLAW: Well, actually, that's not true, he worked with the DEA since April 2019 on operations --

THE COURT: Who?

MS. JAROSLAW: Mr. Talreja worked with the DEA since April 2019.

THE COURT: Is the DEA an intelligence agency?

MS. JAROSLAW: He was introduced to the DEA by an intelligence agency, and I don't think Mr. Li would dispute

1 that.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MS. JAROSLAW: And he did work on operations with the DEA overseas traveling hundreds of thousands of miles with the DEA. The tangible case he worked on here in the Southern District of New York is he made I believe a number of recordings allowing the arrest of the defendant in which is before Judge Cote at the present time.

THE COURT: I know about Judge Cote's case. I have spoken to her at length about this a couple of times.

MS. JAROSLAW: I see. I guess we get to the point, as I said, where one has to make inferences. If Mr. Talreja were of the mindset to abscond, the perfect time would have been right after the April 30 conference when your Honor was understandably not pleased at Mr. Talreja's failure to appear.

THE COURT: You mean the Philadelphia thing?

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes, although I believe the DEA provided information to Mr. Li that in fact Mr. Talreja was in California at the time. I don't know if he was in California or Philadelphia, but my inference, based on the fact that we called him at approximately 1:30 New York time and we woke him up suggests to me he may well have been in California.

THE COURT: But he said he was in Philadelphia, fine.

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes. Again, a rational person who was

inclined to flee had every opportunity then. He had his passport, he had no GPS monitor. Whether he was in California or Philadelphia, it would have been a relatively simple matter to leave the United States. Instead, he returned the following day, as instructed by the Court, surrendered his passport, got fitted for a GPS monitor, then the question is: How? How and why would my client flee on June 21st?

The "why" certainly makes no sense because, your Honor, this is, at bottom, a bad check, a successful bad check where a defendant converted \$116,000. He had a number of factors that were mitigating, and with due respect, I think I could have made a very strong, perhaps ultimately persuasive argument for time served at the time. And I advised him that he was in a good position, vis-a-vis sentencing, not to worry.

So why did he leave and how did he leave? And again, your Honor, I submit that it's not — it doesn't make sense that he could do this on his own. Keep in mind that he has had these ties with law enforcement and intelligence. He had to have been helped. He could not have cut the bracelet and successfully left the United States without help. There's no other possible explanation than him having help. The GPS monitor showed that between May 1st and June 21st, Mr. Talreja never left his neighborhood. He never went beyond his pharmacy. He never went beyond the market. He didn't go into Flushing to get a fake passport, he didn't meet with people

uptown to get fake ID, he stayed in his neighborhood. So how could he possibly leave without assistance?

And the fact that he so brazenly calls Mr. Li, the fact that he reaches out to me on a regular basis, provides me with information, that seemed to be corroborated by news reports, of things that he's involved in, it doesn't make sense. If he were on his own, one would expect him, perhaps, to hide in a basement in Alberta, Canada, not to be poking the bear and contacting Mr. Li and inserting himself in Judge Cote's case. He would only do that if he felt secure and safe enough to do that. And how could he feel secure and safe enough to do some of the things he's doing without the protection of some government entity or entities?

THE COURT: Assume that what you say is right. I'm not accepting it necessarily, but assume it. So what? He's still under the jurisdiction of this Court and he absconded.

MS. JAROSLAW: Absolutely. And that's an affront to this Court.

THE COURT: I couldn't care if he's working for the Queen of England, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Prime Minister of New Zealand or the Prime Minister of Canada.

MS. JAROSLAW: All of which are possibilities.

THE COURT: I couldn't care if he was working for the DEA, he's under the jurisdiction of this Court, not some foreign intelligence agency or even the DEA.

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes, your Honor, it's absolutely an affront to this Court. It's an affront to your Honor. It's an affront to the justice system --

THE COURT: To you, too.

MS. JAROSLAW: -- to a defense attorney who did not tell him to pursue this path, to the government. It is an affront, and I do not deny that, and I would go so far to say that my client would not deny it. It's truly an affront to this Court. I don't minimize it. I was in Mr. Li's chair for many years. I take this Court seriously and I don't approve of the course of action. I make that clear. However, how should the Court handle that, assuming it's true -- and I understand your Honor does not necessarily accept it as true -- but assuming it is true, the question is: What are the consequences of that fact?

The question is: Who was responsible for Mr. Talreja affronting this Court, ignoring the orders to appear when he was supposed to appear? And I would submit that he's ultimately not responsible, and it's an issue at the level of the State Department and at the level of our intelligence agencies.

But Mr. Talreja is a pawn caught between different governments. And given his experience at the MCC -- and I provide the Court with genuine detail. And I was there myself before the lockdown. It was a terrifying experience for

Mr. Talreja, made all the worse by his mental condition. Given the consequences of coming back here, where perhaps I would have been successful in getting time served, but then perhaps he would be put in ICE custody — and he was equally terrified of ICE custody — or a government or governments offering him a path to safety, to what he viewed as safety, it's not what I would recommend, I condemn the choice, but it's not an irrational choice for which he should be held responsible in the United States. It's perhaps a diplomatic issue.

But the crime that he committed and the crime he was charged with and pled guilty to with no conditions, he has paid for that crime. He has spent hard, hard time at the MCC and been traumatized by it, which I submit was a huge factor in his ultimate weighing of what his best course was. And I don't think the punishment in a case for a bad check should reflect the difficult Catch-22 choice he found himself in.

Mr. Talreja means to do well, and he has made mistakes, and he will be the first to admit that. He is trying to accomplish something in his mind; and again, he experiences mania, he experiences periods of depression. In his mind, he is making a positive contribution to the world. Again, not the path I would recommend at this time, I would have recommended he get sentenced first and then pursue that path, but this is what he's chosen out of genuine, well-founded fear. And I think mercy is warranted here because this isn't a case of

someone who was granted bail from the start. He was seriously punished for seven-plus weeks, and I submit that's sufficient for passing a bad check.

The Court will enter an order of restitution, and that's entirely appropriate, and the Court can enter a sentence of time served with supervised release. And your Honor, should he return to the United States and be arrested, your Honor can then see him face to face and see whether any additional time is warranted. And I submit that there's no purpose in this courtroom, there's absolutely no purpose to be served by imposing some sentence of imprisonment. I don't see how that satisfies any of the ends of justice or any of the ends for which sentencing is appropriate.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MS. JAROSLAW: No, your Honor, unless there are any questions.

THE COURT: I should have asked and I didn't ask, it's obvious from your letters, did you read the probation report?

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes, I read the probation report, your Honor.

THE COURT: And are you ready for sentence?

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes, I'm ready for sentence. And having spoken to Mr. Talreja, he was ready to be sentenced in absentia.

THE COURT: The objections to the report which are

listed, I am ruling with the probation department, not in your favor on any of those objections. I can't ask whether the defendant read it of the defendant because he's not here.

So go ahead, Mr. Li.

MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor. I would like to start with something the defense counsel said in discussing potentially how and why the defendant fled in June. She suggested that if in fact he received assistance from a foreign government or foreign intelligence agency, then ultimately he would not be responsible for his own flight. I think that statement really cuts to the heart of two of the issues before the Court, which is whether the defendant has really taken responsibility for his actions and whether he abides by the rule of law.

I think that statement is very revealing. Even if the defendant received what I might call a better offer to go somewhere else with the assistance of a foreign government or a foreign intelligence agency or whoever, that does not excuse him violating the orders of this Court or taking it upon himself to decide that he will no longer be subject to this Court's order or sentencing. He is responsible for his flight. There's no suggestion that he was somehow kidnapped or taken away without his consent. At most, the defense is suggesting that he might have received help from somebody in leaving. That's not an excuse. That does not absolve him of

responsibility.

THE COURT: There's no evidence of that.

MR. LI: And there's no evidence of that, that's exactly right.

THE COURT: That's pure speculation.

MR. LI: Not only, your Honor, is it pure speculation, but the government in fact contacted the intelligence agency that the defense had proffered and that intelligence agency denied that they assisted or facilitated his escape. So no, there is no factual basis at all for this suggestion.

But I want to go back to acceptance of responsibility and the nature and characteristics of the defendant.

THE COURT: You're repeating what's in your letter.

MR. LI: Yes, your Honor, and I don't mean to repeat.

I do want to point out a couple of things, actually, in the defendant's submission that I think are revealing. The Court noted earlier that this is not the defendant's first conviction, that, in fact, he has sustained ten convictions.

THE COURT: I misspoke, I said in the United Kingdom,
I should have said Australia. He has ten convictions in
Australia, not in the United Kingdom. I think he had one more
in the United Kingdom.

MR. LI: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I misspoke earlier, go ahead.

MR. LI: But one thing I think that's revealing about

the defendant's submission is that the defendant includes a, I think, really powerful and heartfelt letter from his father. In that letter from the father he writes about the defendant's fraud that he had conducted in Australia, and he notes that the fraud in Australia was really directed at his father. He sort of suggests — I don't think he says it explicitly, but he suggests that essentially the defendant had stolen from his own father. And the father also goes on to say that he used the proceeds of this fraud to fund what he called a six-month jaunt around the world.

I think what this tells your Honor is that contrary to the defendant's suggestion that his conduct here was some sort of one-time act in a fit of a manic episode, in fact this is conduct completely in accord with his prior conduct, conduct that even his own family agrees was done for greed so that he could fund a lifestyle that allowed him to travel for six months across the world.

I don't intend to repeat my sentencing submission, your Honor. I do want to say one word about the defendant's submission, which is the defendant, in addition to sort of deflecting responsibility on this foreign intelligence agency, also attributes various, I'll just call it thuggish actions and statements by the government attorneys and agencies. This is false, it's unequivocally false. But you don't have to just take my word for it, you can look at what the government has

actually done in this case and every single courtesy, great and small, that the government has extended to the defendant.

The government could have arrested the defendant when he was in Hawaii in January. The government said wait until he comes back from his trip and arrested him in New York. The government could have denied him an opportunity to proffer, not let him speak and try to take responsibility. The government gave him that opportunity. The government could not have agreed to bail in March. The government did, in fact, consent to bail. The government could have insisted that he then go into ICE detention because he is not lawfully in the United States. In fact, at the request of the defense attorney, the defendant's attorney, we reached essentially an agreement with ICE that the defendant would not be taken into ICE custody pending his sentencing.

The government could have insisted after he fled the first time to Philadelphia that he then be detained. The government did not insist on that, and the Court in fact allowed the defendant to remain on bail. After the defendant couldn't get co-defendants, the government consented yet again to modifying his bail conditions so that he would not have to get cosigners for his \$100,000 bond. The government in this case has extended to the defendant every courtesy, great and small, and there is simply nothing to substantiate that the government has somehow abused him or taken thuggish actions or

1 | made thuggish statements towards him.

I'm prepared to answer any questions that the Court may have, but otherwise I rely on our sentencing submission, including our request for the enhancements stated in our brief and our request for a restitution order attached to our sentencing submission.

THE COURT: Can you tell me something that is so secret that it can't be divulged, what intelligence agency of which nation did you contact?

MR. LI: Sure, I will tell the Court. I may ask at the close of this and after discussing with defense counsel that certain portions of the transcript be redacted, especially if we talk about --

THE COURT: Just tell me the country and redact that.

MR. LI: Sure. , the relevant intelligence --

THE COURT: All right. It's redacted as to which country he allegedly served in gathering intelligence, that's stricken. Not stricken, but redacted.

Okay, fine. Anything else?

MR. LI: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything in rebuttal, briefly?

MS. JAROSLAW: Very briefly, your Honor. I do want to say that Mr. Li couldn't have been more professional. Mr. Li did extend courtesies to my client and Mr. Li acted to the

highest standard of the profession, and we have nothing to criticize about Mr. Li's handling of the case. I won't go into further detail than my letter, but I will say that what Mr. Li characterizes as thuggish actions were in fact taken, as alleged in the letter, by the law enforcement agents, and we in no way hold Mr. Li responsible for that.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I compliment both of you on particularly your written submissions. They were thorough and thoughtful, and I indicated the reason that I look favorably upon what is to be a formal application for appointment under the Criminal Justice Act is particularly those written submissions and the fact that you've come down here today and did a good job.

All right. The presentence report is dated May 29 of this year. The defendant absconded twice and he is still at large, as we've indicated. He's a 30-year old Australian. The details of his background in Australia and his prior criminal record is mentioned briefly in the probation report. He has ten Australian convictions and apparently one in Great Britain. And he had difficulties in France, which Ms. Jaroslaw seeks to correct, because he wasn't detained in France, in her letter replying to the government submission.

The presentence report was written before he absconded and sent the email which I read from. And the presentence report completely fails, because it was before he absconded, to

take into consideration, in fixing the offense level and guideline range, the fact that he did abscond and sent the letter, the email that I mentioned.

The government's submission of September 9, 2020 sets forth his fraudulent conduct in this case, which was extensive, it involved a \$500,000 check, and the need for restitution of \$116,692.73 to the victim of the criminal activity, which is the Chase National Bank. I signed an order of restitution. The defendant absconded first on June 21st, then he absconded again, and I read, as I said, from the email.

The defense submission of September 9 is very thorough and seeks time served, as Ms. Jaroslaw said. I also, with the defense submission, received a letter from the defendant's father and two friends in Australia.

The total offense level I find here pursuant -- well, first of all, before getting to what I find to be the offense level, in the probation report the offense level is set at 16, and that incorporated a 12-point enhancement for the intended loss, which I find to be \$500,000, and there was a three-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility. That was in the probation report before the absconding, and there was a Criminal History Category of Roman Numeral I. That made the guideline range 21 to 27 months.

But then the second absconding occurred, and I believe that he made false statements while on bail, and I think that

the government is correct when it urges a two-point enhancement for obstruction of justice and that there should be no three-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

Therefore, the total offense level I find to be 21, and the Criminal History Category of Roman Numeral I, calls for a range under the guidelines of 37 to 46 months.

Frankly, the defendant is a fraudster. That is what he seems to do more for a living than anything else. I seriously thought about giving him a sentence at the top of the guidelines of 46 months, but I'm going to give a sentence of 37 months. He's to be committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States or the Attorney General's authorized representative for the period of 37 months on this case if he's ever apprehended.

He's to serve a period of five years supervised release under the mandatory and standard conditions of supervised release, plus the special conditions that are set forth in the probation report at page 17, and those special conditions are as follows:

He's to provide probation with access to any financial information that they request. He's not to incur any new open lines of credit or charges without the approval of probation. He's to obey the immigration laws and comply with the directives of the immigration authorities. If he's ever apprehended, he's to be supervised by the district of residence

in the United States, and a \$100 special assessment is fixed as required by law.

I have ordered restitution of \$116,692.73. And if he's ever apprehended, he's advised of his right to appeal. That's the sentence of the Court.

Thank you, both counsel, for your attention to the matter. And I will receive the application from you next Wednesday, Ms. Jaroslaw.

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes, your Honor. Two other things, I have been instructed to file a notice of appeal, and on my own application I ask to be relieved.

THE COURT: You have been instructed to file a notice of appeal?

MS. JAROSLAW: Yes.

THE COURT: Who instructed you?

MS. JAROSLAW: My client.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. JAROSLAW: My intent is to file the notice, and then I request that your Honor relieve me.

THE COURT: The question of relieving, once an appeal is filed, goes to the Court of Appeals, doesn't it?

MS. JAROSLAW: I believe filing a notice is protective; and by filing a notice, counsel does not automatically become counsel on appeal.

THE COURT: You are certainly relieved of

representation. After I fix any remuneration for you under the 1 Criminal Justice Act, you're relieved in this Court. 2 3 MS. JAROSLAW: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 MR. LI: Your Honor, one final application from the government. Just with respect to redaction from the public 6 7 transcript, there was reference made to 8 , which is a sealed case pending before Judge Cote. 9 T would ask --THE COURT: That's in the written submission. 10 11 MR. LI: No, in the discussion before the Court today. 12 THE COURT: You mentioned ? 13 MR. LI: The defense counsel mentioned that case. So 14 I would ask that the name of that case, the docket number and 15 the name of the defendant, be redacted from the public version 16 of the transcript. 17 THE COURT: The case is sealed, so ordered. 18 MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor. 19 MS. JAROSLAW: Thank you, your Honor. And just to be 20 clear, the submissions by the defense will be filed under seal, 21 is that correct? 22 THE COURT: No. 23 MS. JAROSLAW: No? 24 THE COURT: There's no reference to a particular 25 I said all bets were off when he absconded. No, country. No.

# K9GTTALS - REDACTED that application is denied. Thank you very much, both of you. MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay, thank you. (Adjourned)